

TOUR OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY

*795. [83] Sri. R. K. Ram: Will the Hon'ble Chief Minister be pleased to state.—

(a) whether the Chief Secretary is submitting to Government tour diary as in the case of officers; if so who is scrutinising the tour diary;

(b) whether any verification of the T. A. bill is done by anybody with reference to such tour diaries;

(c) what is the total amount received by the Chief Secretary by way of T. A. in the year 1950; and

(d) how many days in the year 1950 the Chief Secretary was not in the headquarters?

Chief Minister (Sri. C. Kesavan):

(a) No; the latter part does not arise.

(b) Does not arise in view of the answer to (a).

(c) Rs. 9,154—12—0.

(d) 72 days of which 25 were public holidays.

RARE EARTHS LTD.

*796. [87] Sri. R. K. Ram: Will the Hon'ble Minister for Industries be pleased to state.—

(a) the terms under which the Rare Earths Ltd. has been formed;

(b) the position of the State Government vis a vis the central Government;

(c) the rate at which the raw materials of mineral sands are to be supplied to this factory;

(d) the maximum offer made for this commodity by others; and

(e) the person or persons who represented Government in the discussions that took place in connection with the formation of the Rare Earths Ltd.

Minister for Education, Food and Labour (Sri. T. K. Narayana Pillai):

(a) The Indian Rare Earths Ltd., has been formed on condition that 55% of the shares will be taken by the Government of India while this Government will be allotted 45% of the share. This Government will have 2 representatives on the Board of management consisting of seven members. A third condition is that the Monazite Factory which will be managed by the Company will be set up at Alwaye.

(b) answer to a is referred to.

(c) 25 sh. per ton (N.A.W.) of Monazite.

(d) does not arise since monazite cannot be sold or exported from India, without sanction of government.

(e) Sri. C. Kumara Das and Sri. Moodgil took part in the early discussions on the subject. Consequent upon their retirement, Hon'ble Sri. E. John Philipose and Sri. K. G. Menon represented this Government during the discussions.

APPENDIX

(Vide answer to question No. 783)

Government Servants' Conduct Rules

65. Publication of documents and communications to the Press in the name of Government servants and public speeches. No Government servant shall, in

any document published by him or in any communication made by him to the Press or in any public utterance delivered by him, make any statement of fact or opinion which is capable of embarrassing—

(a) the relations between the Government and the people or any section thereof.

(b) the relations between the Government and the Government of India, and

(c) the relations between the Government and any other Indian State, or any foreign country.

66. A Government servant who intends to publish any document or to make any communication to the Press or to deliver any public utterance containing statements in respect of which any doubt as to the application of the restrictions imposed by rule 65 may arise, shall submit to Government a copy or draft of the document which he intends to publish or of the utterance which he intends to deliver, and shall thereafter act in accordance with such orders as may be passed by Government.

The rules regarding discussion of Government policy and action and publication of documents and communications apply to the Advocate-General, Government Pleaders, Public Prosecutors and other part-time Government servants.

FINANCIAL BUSINESS

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—(cont.)

Demand XVIII—Education

Minister for Education, Food and Labour (Sri. T. K. Narayana Pillai): Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 2,88,25,600 under Demand XVIII—Education and request the House to sanction it.

Minister for Law, Finance, and Revenue (Sri. A. J. John): I second it.

Sri. N. D. Jose: Sir, I move—

“To reduce the allotment of Rs. 25,00,000 for Block Grant to the Travancore University by Re. 1”.

I want to draw the attention of this House to certain facts. It is some time since this University has been without a Vice-Chancellor. There was a Vice-Chancellor who was got down from outside Travancore-Cochin, quite a distinguished man. He resigned and left his post. I believe, this House is entitled to know the reasons that led to the resignation of the previous Vice-Chancellor and as to why he left his job. There are various rumours concerning his resignation of Vice-Chancellorship. It is said he resigned because, certain recommendation for appointments made by him was not accepted by Government or rather his recommendation was over-ruled by the Government. There is also an allegation to the effect that the Vice-Chancellor was not invited to certain important functions conducted by Government. I am not in a position to categorically assess the correctness of this statement. I only point out that this House is entitled to know the reasons that led to his resignation. It is said that there were divergent views between the Minister and the Vice-Chancellor on certain matters. Further, the Vice-Chancellor made a political speech at Madras to clinch the issue. A week after that the Vice-Chancellor resigned and left the State. Essentially, if a Vice-Chancellor cannot be brought down from outside I should suggest that persons of capacity from this University should be appointed to take the place.